

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow.

No claims are currently being canceled, added or amended.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12 and 17-24 remain pending in this application.

It is respectfully requested that this after-final reply be considered and entered, since: a) it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance, b) no new issues that would require further consideration and/or search have been made.

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter that "was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The phrase 'the sender number corresponds to a telephone set of the sender' of claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 are not disclosed in the specification."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. In particular, page 4, lines 20-23 of the specification states that "the sender number identifier 26 identifies sender number A2 corresponding to the telephone set 62." As described elsewhere in the specification, a call is made from telephone set 62 to telephone set 61, and thus telephone set 62 corresponds to a telephone set of the sender.

In response to the comment made in the sentence bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, in which "the Examiner has provided evidences that the sender number does not have to be a number corresponds to the caller's telephone set . . . A sender number can be a calling card number to be used for storing the voice message in a particular memory address", in the case described by the Examiner, if the voice mail apparatus has not stored beforehand a correspondence between a particular calling card number of a caller and a particular sender having a particular e-mail address, no correspondence will be

found in a correspondence table of the voice mail apparatus. If, for example, a particular sender has two different phones (e.g., a land line phone and a cell phone) with two different e-mail addresses for those two different phones, then it is possible that the voice mail apparatus would store, in a table, two separate entries for one sender, whereby, based on a determination as to which phone a particular call was being initiated from, one of those two entries would be retrieved from the table so as to provide a corresponding e-mail address of the sender to the recipient of the call.

Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 are fully supported by the specification, and these claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,052,442 to Cooper et al. in view of JP-405227274A to Inoue and U.S. Patent No. 4,972,461 to Brown; and claims 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al., and Inoue and Brown and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,304,636 to Goldberg. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

The Office Action correctly acknowledges that Cooper et al. fails to teach "the digitized voice . . . by the identifier." However, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Brown et al. teaches this feature on column 5, lines 13-14 and column 16, lines 33-34.

In more detail, Brown discloses a system that allows a caller's voice message to be stored at a call delivery service (CDS), whereby the caller's voice message is then sent to a called party by the CDS at a later time. This is different from the present invention in which a voice message from a caller is stored at a voice mail apparatus in accordance with a sender number of a sender's telephone set, to thereby allow the called party to respond to the voice message from the caller in an expeditious manner. In Brown, a CDS stores the caller's voice message, which is then retrieved and sent to a called party when the caller provides the proper billing information to pay for the sending of the

voice message. For example, if a caller is trying to call a called party but keeps getting a busy signal, then the caller can record a voice message, which is stored at the CDS, whereby the CDS keeps trying to call the called party in order to retrieve the stored voice message to be sent to the called party when a ring signal and pickup occurs. This has nothing at all to do with a voice mail apparatus (a device on a network) storing a voice message from a sender of a voice mail, to thereby allow the recipient of the voice mail to respond to that voice mail via an e-mail.

Furthermore, as clearly described in column 16, lines 33-34 of Brown, the voice message is stored in the CDS according to the billing code of the caller, and it is not stored based on the identification of the sender number as performed by an identifier. This is especially the case since the sender may be calling the CDS from a phone booth which corresponds to a temporary phone number of the sender.

For example, if a sender has two different sender numbers stored in the table of the present invention, then a particular call from the sender would result in one of those two table entries being retrieved. In Brown, on the contrary, only one table entry is provided for storing voice messages from a particular sender.

With all due respect, a billing code of a sender, which would be the same no matter where the sender makes his/her call from, is much different from a sender number that corresponds to a telephone set of the sender.

For example, in the present invention, the sender's phone number is attached to the digitized voice, and the sender's phone number is identified and used to store the digitized voice at a memory location corresponding to the sender's phone number. In Brown, on the other hand, a particular billing code of a sender is identified and used to store a voice message, whereby the sender presumably only has one billing code assigned to him/her (to distinguish it from billing codes assigned to other persons). Thus, Brown's method of storing voice messages operates in a much different way than in the present invention.

See, for example, method claims 11 and 12, each of which recites a step of "performing retrieval of a table to find an e-mail address of the sender . . . , in which the retrieval is based on the sender number." In Brown, at best, a retrieval would be based solely on a billing code of a sender and not on a sender number.

Accordingly, since none of the other cited art of record makes up for these deficiencies of Brown, all of the presently pending claims are patentable.

Therefore, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

March 31, 2004
Date

Phillip J. Articola
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Washington Harbour
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20007-5109
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399